

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 17, 19, and 23 have been amended. No claims have been added. No claims have been canceled.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-12, 14, 16-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao (U.S. 6,081,840) in view of Easty et al. (U.S. 6,490,587). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The present invention as claimed sets forth intercepting a request from a second client to a server on a wide area network (WAN) for a content object and satisfying that request with the content object from the first client itself, which previously downloaded the content. Thus, one peer device is supplying the content to other peer device where both peers are on a local network.

Zhao does not disclose such an arrangement. Zhao merely discloses a source content server replicating its content on some local content servers and supplying users from those local content servers. There is no peer-to-peer caching in the transfer of downloaded content objects. Easty does not overcome these deficiencies. Easty also does not disclose arrangement from content from one peer supplied to the other peer. Thus, the combination of Zhao and Easty does not disclose all the elements to the claim. In view of this, Applicant respectfully submits the present invention is not obvious in view of Zhao and Easty.

Futhermore, the present invention as claimed sets forth in claim 1 sets forth the client receiving an indication from a controller that a new content object is available and receiving an indication from the controller where that content is located. Thereafter, the first client downloads content. Zhao does not disclose such an arrangement as admitted by the Examiner in the Office Action. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that Zhao didn't disclose the first client receiving an

indication of a location of the content object from controller. However, the Examiner believed that Easty did disclose such an arrangement. Easty shows content being refreshed by a central server automatically delivering content to end point databases in end point servers. There is no teaching of having a client device receive an indication from the controller that tells it that new information is available and having the controller provide an indication of where that content is to enable the client to download the content object from that location. In view of this, Applicant respectfully submits present invention as claims is not obvious in view of Zhao and Easty.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome by the amendments and the remarks. Applicant submits that claims 1-12, 14, 16-23 as amended are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner rejected claims 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhao (U.S. 6,081,840) in view of Easty et al. (U.S. 6,490,587) as applied to claims 1 and 17 above and further in view of Reisman et al. (U.S. 6,658,464).

As set forth above, the present invention as claimed requires intercepting a request from a second client to a web server on a WAN for content object and satisfying that request from the first client that previously downloaded the content object in response to the controller indicating that the content was available and providing a location for that content. As set forth above, Zhao and Easty do not disclose this arrangement. Reisman does not overcome this deficiency. In fact, Reisman does not disclose such an interception scheme providing content between peers as set forth in the claim. In view of this, Applicant respectfully submits the present invention as claimed is not obvious in view of Zhao, Easty and Reisman.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome by the amendments and the remarks. Applicant submits that claims 13 and 15 as amended are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 7/15/95

By: ✓
Michael J. Mallie
Reg. No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(408) 720-8300